DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 069 SP 005 005

TITLE	Aperiodic Report: Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Evaluation. No. 4, An Evaluation of Clustering in TTT.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Dec 70
NOTE	71p.; Submitted to Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Programs, *Grouping Procedures, *Program Evaluation, *Teacher Education, *Teacher Educator Education, *Teacher Programs

ABSTRACT

Information is provided about various aspects of the clustering activities of the TTT program for 1969-70. Specific information about the purposes, means, and outcomes of clustering is presented, as is information about the organization of clusters and the extent of parity in TTT. The data was obtained from observations of meetings by evaluation staff, completed questionnaires of cluster meeting participants, completed interviews of project directors, and communications of the evaluation staff with persons involved in the national TTT program. The data indicated that participants generally agreed with the purpose of the cluster activity. The specific purposes of stimulating exchange and interaction and disseminating information among program components were rated highest in personal importance. The geographic basis of clustering was regarded by many as unsatisfactory, and the usefulness of cluster meetings as a clustering activity was inconclusive. Questionnaire respondents felt that parity seemed to be more extensive at the project than the cluster level, and that at the project level more occurred in planning than in operational aspects. The amount of parity at the project level was viewed with confidence as likely to increase significantly in the future. (MBM)

ED053069

APERIODIC REPORT: TRAINERS OF TEACHER TRAINERS (TTT) EVALUATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NO. 4

AN EVALUATION OF CLUSTERING IN TTT

December 1970

An evaluation of the concept and implementation of clustering in the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program for 1969-1970.

Submitted to CONSORTIUM OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs

Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
(CIRCE)
270 Education Building, University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Telephone: (217) 333-3771

SP005005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Overview	1
The Concept of Clustering	3
Evaluation Rationale	5
Sources of Data	6
Cluster Meeting Observation Form	7
Cluster Meeting Registration Form	8
TTT Project Director Phone Interview Schedule	9
TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire	9
Other Data Sources	11
Characteristics of Questionnaire Respondents	12
Reactions to Clustering	14
Purposes of Clustering and their Achievement	14
The Organizational Structure of Clusters	24
Knowledge and Impact of Clustering	27
Reactions to Cluster Meetings	29
Parity	34
Appendix A: Cluster Meeting Observation Form	
Appendix B: Cluster Meeting Registration Form	
Appendix C: TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire	
Appendix D: Summary Data from TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire	

AN EVALUATION OF CLUSTERING IN TTT[1]

Overview

This report attempts to provide information about various aspects of the clustering activities of the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program for 1969-70. Specific information about the purposes, means, and outcomes of clustering are presented, as is information about the organization of clusters and the extent of parity in TTT. The sources of data from which this information was obtained include observations of meetings by evaluation staff, completed questionnaires of cluster meeting participants, completed interviews of project directors, and communications of the evaluation staff with persons involved in the National TTT Program. Of these sources of data, the questionnaire (TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire) administered to a random sample of cluster meeting participants was the major source of data upon which the findings of this report were based.

The data indicated that the participants of cluster meetings generally agreed with the purpose of the cluster activity. The specific clustering purposes of "stimulating exchange and interaction" and "disseminating information among program components" were rated highest in personal importance by the participants. These two purposes were also regarded by participants as being most successfully achieved. The specific purpose "to provide communication between projects and USOE" was regarded by cluster meeting participants as being most important to USOE personnel.

---

[1]Special recognition is due to Miss Margie Pjojian and Mrs. Sherrie Rosenkoetter for their assistance in preparing this report.

The geographic basis of clustering was regarded by many as unsatisfactory. Most of these respondents would have preferred a topical basis of organizing clustering. Substantial evidence was obtained for promoting greater flexibility and variety in the organization of clusters. Supplemental means for facilitating local initiative and for grouping persons periodically with others who share common interests as well as with people with a variety of interests was recommended.

Almost all cluster meeting participants were at least "somewhat" familiar with their projects' activities, and about three-fourths of these participants were familiar with their clusters' activities. Their familiarity with their cluster activities was attributed to either contacts made at cluster meetings or contacts made personally. The extent to which persons interacted directly with the personnel of cluster activities with which they were highly impressed was significant. The impact of this interaction resulted in changes in approximately two-thirds of the respondents or for their projects.

The usefulness of cluster meetings as a clustering activity was inconclusive. Cluster meeting participants who had less extensive involvement with the TTT Program found the meetings more useful than persons with extensive involvement. But persons with extensive involvement found subsequent cluster meetings improved over earlier meetings.

Finally, questionnaire respondents felt that parity seemed to be more extensive at the project than the cluster level, and that at the project level, more occurred in planning than in operational aspects. The amount of parity at the project level was viewed, with confidence as increasing significantly in the future.

The Concept of Clustering

One requirement for each TTT project is free and cooperative exchange of ideas, personnel, and other resources with other TTT projects. Yet, the extreme diversity of activities among a large number of TTT projects within the National TTT Program requires a unique administrative mechanism for interproject interaction. During initial stages of the National TTT Program, planners decided that grouping the individual projects into clusters would promote greater communication between projects than if activities were organized for the entire Program. The purposes of clustering include dissemination of information, exchange of leadership strategies, interproject coordination and cooperation, project development, monitoring of projects, and sharing of resources.

During 1969-70, the main basis of clustering has been geographic. Six clusters were formed, with each cluster consisting of six to twelve projects. The geographic basis was selected for practical reasons (e.g., amount of time and money available for travel to cluster meetings and to sites of other projects within the cluster), and was not the only means of delimiting clusters. Exceptions to geographical grouping are the University of Washington (in Seattle), which is included in the Northeast Cluster; State University of New York (at Buffalo) and the University of Arizona (in Tucson), included in the Midwest Cluster; Harvard University (in Massachusetts) and the University of Wisconsin (in Milwaukee), in the Southern Cluster; and the University of Nebraska (in Lincoln), in the Southwest Cluster.

Following is a list of the six TTT clusters and the projects within each. Asterisks (*) indicate the centers through which cluster activities have been administered.

Appalachian Cluster

*University of Pittsburgh
Carnegie-Mellon University
Cleveland State University
University of Tennessee
Temple University
University of Maryland
West Virginia State Department of Education
Central State University
Wayne County
Wayne State University
D. C. Schools
New York University

Midwest Cluster

*Northwestern University
University of Illinois
The Chicago Consortium
University of Chicago
Indiana University
University of Minnesota
North Dakota Project
University of Wisconsin (Madison)
Michigan State University
State University of New York (Buffalo)
University of Arizona
Atlanta University

Northeast Cluster

*Clark University
Connecticut Commission on Higher Education (two projects)
Syracuse University
City University of New York
Bank Street College of Education
Fordham University
Board of Cooperative Educational Services (New York)
University of Washington

Southern Cluster

*University of Miami
University of South Florida
Florida State University
Florida A and M University
Auburn University
George Peabody College
Tennessee A and I University
Southern Illinois University
University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee)
Harvard University

Southwest Cluster

*Southeastern State College
(Durant, Oklahoma)
University of Nebraska
Colorado Commission on Higher
Education
University of Missouri
Washington University (St. Louis)
West Texas State University
Texas Southern University

West Coast Cluster

*San Jose State College
San Fernando Valley State College
San Francisco State College
University of Oregon
Washington State Department of
Public Instruction
Portland State University

Evaluation Rationale

The purpose of evaluating the National TTT Program is to provide continuous, systematic feedback of information to relevant groups so that they can make sound judgments leading to program improvement. In any evaluation endeavor, certain constraints (e.g., time, money, availability of data, and skills of the evaluators) are placed upon the

evaluators which necessitate the careful analysis of the particular situation so that important questions concerning the collection and analysis of data can be answered. The types and sources of data which are needed, the methods of data collection, and the appropriate methods of analyzing such data must also be determined.

The main reason for gathering data concerning cluster activity is to determine how well the intended purposes of clustering are being fulfilled. Data relevant to ascertaining the effectiveness of clustering include type of participants in cluster activity, types of clustering occurring, and perceptions and attitudes of the various participants toward the cluster and its activities. Such information is relevant in an evaluation of the National TTT Program as a whole, especially since clustering is such an important component of it. In addition, the evaluation of clustering in TTT can yield insights concerning the possible implementation of clustering in programs other than the National TTT Program.

Sources of Data

After careful consideration of the particular questions to be answered regarding cluster activity and the constraints placed upon the evaluators, a number of instruments to help gather data were developed. These instruments include the Cluster Meeting Observation Form, the Cluster Meeting Registration Form, the TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire, and the TTT Project Director Phone Interview Schedule. Most of the emphasis was on cluster meetings themselves,

but these instruments also yielded data on other aspects of clustering and cluster activities. The instruments and their use in this evaluation as well as other sources of data are briefly described in the following sections.

Cluster Meeting Observation Form. Members of the evaluation team, all associated with the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE) at the University of Illinois, attended selected meetings of individual clusters as participant-observers. In conjunction with visits to cluster meetings, the Cluster Meeting Observation Form was used (Appendix A). This form includes items with reference to type of session attended, quantitative description of those in attendance (in terms of sex, race, and group affiliation), physical conditions of the meeting room, and descriptions and ratings of each presentation and major presenter, if any. CIRCE observers were instructed to familiarize themselves well with the contents of the form so that the use of the form itself would be unnecessary while actually observing. Observers took notes during sessions and less formal encounters with participants at the meetings and used such notes to later complete the information requested on the form. They were instructed to describe accurately events taking place, being careful to differentiate fact from opinion. In addition, observers were instructed to obtain for CIRCE's use at least one copy of all materials distributed during meetings.

Following is a chronological list of meetings held by clusters which CIRCE staff members attended and collected data with the Cluster Meeting Observation Form.

Cluster and Meeting Location	Date	CIRCE Representatives
West Coast San Diego, California	June 27-28, 1969	Terry Denny
Southern and Appalachian Atlanta, Georgia	July 24-25, 1969	Terry Denny J. Thomas Hastings
Southwest Denver, Colorado	July 25-27, 1969	J. Thomas Hastings Douglas Sjogren
Midwest Chicago, Illinois	July 28-29, 1969	Terry Denny
Northeast New York, New York	October 2-4, 1969	David Addison Arden Grotelueschen
Midwest Minneapolis, Minnesota	November 5-7, 1969	Clencie Cotton Douglas Sjogren
West Coast Seattle, Washington	November 7-9, 1969	Gary Storm
Social Science New Orleans, Lousiana (This was an experimental meeting of a cluster formed on a non-geographical basis.)	January 21-23, 1970	Arden Grotelueschen
Southwest Houston, Texas	January 23-25, 1970	J. Thomas Hastings

Cluster Meeting Registration Form. This form was developed to provide descriptive information concerning all participants at selected cluster meetings (Appendix B). Information requested of the participant includes date of cluster meeting, number of cluster meetings previously attended, project with which the participant is associated, parity group affiliation, main working role in TTT, and nature of any work role outside TTT (with indication of percent working time devoted to each role). Cluster meeting administrators were asked to have each participant

complete the form and then forward all forms to CIRCE. The instrument was made available for use by January 1970, and CIRCE has received completed copies from two of the meetings held since then.

TTT Project Director Phone Interview Schedule. This interview schedule was prepared to gather data from directors of TTT projects refunded for FY 1970-71. Although most of the data gathered by this interview pertain to the project directors' assessment of various aspects of project components (data to be presented in Aperiodic Report No. 3), reactions to clustering were also obtained. Therefore, this source of data is included here.

TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire. This instrument (Appendix C) was constructed to ascertain reactions of participants to cluster meetings and clustering in general. It elicited most of the information found in this report. The questionnaire consists of a set of questions applicable to a number of persons involved in TTT, with the respondent indicating the parity group with which he primarily identifies (e.g., community, education, liberal arts, participant, school), his main working role in TTT (e.g., project director, LTI members, project staff, student, advisory member, consultant), and the percent of his total working time allocated to TTT and other projects. The questionnaire was sent to a randomly selected sample[2] of cluster meeting participants and to all

[2]The number of participants from each institution to whom questionnaires were sent was based on the number of persons (inclusive of project directors) from each institution attending the cluster meeting. A random sample of members listed by project within each cluster was selected according to the scheme which follows: Exclusive of project directors, if less than five person attended from a project, two persons were selected at random. If from 5 to 10 attended, three persons were selected. If from 11 to 20 attended, four persons were selected; and if over 20 attended, five persons were selected.

project directors attending the most recent meeting of a cluster before December 1, 1969.

Since the technique of randomization was used, it is assumed that responses obtained are representative of those that would have been received had all participants at the cluster meeting been included. Questionnaires were sent to sample members in December 1969. By January 1970, responses were received from 62 percent (109 of 175) of those sampled. A follow-up letter including another copy of the questionnaire was then sent to those who had not returned completed questionnaires. The result was the receipt of questionnaires from an additional 16 percent of those sampled (altogether 137 of 175), or a total of 78 percent. An interesting finding was that percentage of questionnaire returns from each cluster was not dependent upon the recency of the last meeting. Following are dates and location of each cluster's most recent meeting prior to December 1, 1969, and figures representing rate of response to the questionnaire.

Cluster, Date, and Location	Sample Response Rate
Southern July 24-25, 1969 Atlanta, Georgia (This cluster met jointly with the first meeting of the Appalachian Cluster.)	86% (18 of 21)
Southwest July 25-27, 1969 Denver, Colorado	90% (18 of 20)
Northeast October 2-4, 1969 New York, New York	69% (22 of 32)

Cluster, Date, and Location	Sample Response Rate
Appalachian October 9-10, 1969 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	64% (23 of 36)
Midwest November 5-7, 1969 Minneapolis, Minnesota	83% (35 of 42)
West Coast November 7-9, 1969 Seattle, Washington	88% (21 of 24)

Summary data from the TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire are included in Appendix D. Simple percentages of responses in each category for each item are reported.[3] It should be noted that because of rounding, percentages indicated do not necessarily total 100 for each item. Relevant cross-tabulations in terms of four variables (respondent characteristics)--cluster group membership, parity group affiliation, primary working role in TTT, and percentage working time spent in that primary role--are available upon request from the Evaluation Staff. What seems to be the most relevant of these findings will be presented when appropriate in this report.

Other Data Sources. Dr. J. Thomas Hastings attended a meeting of TTT Cluster Directors and USOE personnel in New Orleans, Louisiana, on

---

[3]During the analysis of questionnaire data received by CIRCE, the technique of *inductive classification* was used to post-code responses to items for which the respondent was not given specified alternatives. Basically, this technique involves classifying responses to open-ended items in terms of categories the coder constructs after reading each individual's answer to a given item. A list with all possible response categories numbered and arranged in descending order of frequency is thus obtained, and responses of each person are then coded with the number of the appropriate category.

December 14-15, 1969. Those attending the meeting included Drs. Eugene Slaughter, Mary Jane Smalley, William Hazard, Joe Edgington, Donald Bigelow, Hobart Burns, Iris Garfield, Jack Guthrie, and Richard Ford. The meeting was scheduled for "self-evaluation" purposes, including lengthy discussion of various aspects of clustering. Dr. Hastings' notes from this meeting are therefore included as a source of data on clustering.

Other non-instrument-oriented sources of data on clustering are communications--written, telephone, and face-to-face--of persons involved in the National TTT Program with CIRCE staff. For example, CIRCE wrote to each cluster director, requesting copies of any general correspondence sent to project personnel, agendas of cluster meetings, and names and addresses of participants, by project, at each cluster meeting. As a result, many newsletters, cluster reports, and other documents disseminated by the cluster center to projects within each cluster were received by CIRCE. These provided the evaluation team with added insight concerning the implementation of clustering in the National TTT Program.

Characteristics of Questionnaire Respondents

Since this report is organized mainly around the results from the administration of the TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire, it is important to describe the basic characteristics of the questionnaire respondents. Of 137 respondents completing the questionnaire, the most highly represented parity group (58%) was that of persons affiliated with Colleges of Education. The least represented parity group was the participant group (7%). In terms of working role in TTT, most respondents

(57%) were associated directly with projects (either as project directors [28%] or project staff [29%]). Persons with TTT working roles as LTI members, students, and consultants were least represented. Most respondents (26%) were from the Midwest Cluster, with the remaining clusters each being represented by about 15 percent of the respondents.

Approximately one-third of the questionnaire respondents reported spending less than 25 percent of their time in their primary working role with TTT. Another one-third reported spending from 25 to 75 percent of their working time in TTT, with the final one-third spending 75 percent or more time.

In terms of primary role in TTT, as seems obvious, project directors and project staff spend the greatest percentage of their time with TTT, and are less apt to have an outside work role. Advisory members and consultants spend the least percentage of their time with TTT, with all reporting outside work roles and tending to spend the most time in those outside roles.

In terms of parity group, education people appear to spend the greatest amount of their total working time in TTT. Community and liberal arts people appear to spend the majority of their time in outside roles.

About 67 percent of the students (working role) spend at least three-fourths working time in their role in TTT, but 33 percent of the students spend a majority of their time in outside roles. Of the participants (parity group), all spend either less than one-quarter (60%) or at least three-quarters (40%) time in an outside work role. Since the

participant and student groups overlap extensively, such findings appear to be consistent.

A majority of persons (55%) responding to the questionnaire attended the meeting both as a result of their own desire to attend and at another person's request. About 20 percent responding attended the meeting only at another person's request. Of those 20 percent, most attended at the request of either their project director (61%) or cluster director (29%). Most (76%) of the questionnaire respondents had not attended an earlier meeting of their cluster. No students or consultants responding had attended a previous cluster meeting. The only group in which most members had attended previously was that of project directors (53%).

On the basis of the above discussion, respondents to the TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire can be characterized as follows. Most of the respondents represent the education parity group, have the role of either project director or project staff, belong to the Midwest Cluster, spend either less than one-fourth or greater than three-fourths time in their primary role in TTT, have a work role outside TTT, attended the cluster meeting of concern as a result of both their own and another person's desire, and had not attended a previous cluster meeting.

Reactions to Clusterin

Purposes of Clustering and their Achievement. The following major purposes of clustering were listed on the questionnaire: to monitor and give direction to projects, to coordinate projects for their mutual benefit; to disseminate information among program components; to foster and establish a broad base of support for the program; to stimulate

exchange and interaction; and to provide communication between the project and USOE. The questionnaire respondent rated these purposes in terms of the importance he personally placed on them on the basis of three categories--"very important," "somewhat important," and "not important." In addition, he indicated, using the categories "quite well," "somewhat," and "not well," how well he felt each purpose was being fulfilled.

Many of the respondents (46%) rated monitoring and giving direction to projects "somewhat important," but 21 percent considered this purpose "not important." No significant differences were found on the basis of parity group. In terms of functional role in TTT, however, 60 percent of the advisory members rated this purpose "very important," while 83 percent of the project directors rated it either "somewhat" or "not important." That so many questionnaire respondents regarded monitoring and giving direction to projects as relatively unimportant is reflected in the fact that not much reference (either implicit or explicit) was made to this objective in non-questionnaire sources of data available to CIRCE. References to this objective centered mainly around the uncertainty which existed concerning the nature of the National TTT Program. It was in terms of defining and making visible the nature of TTT that the advantages of monitoring and giving direction to projects were stressed as a major purpose of clustering.

Coordinating projects for their mutual benefit was cited as "very important" by 49 percent responding to the questionnaire. No significant differences were found in terms of parity group or role in TTT.

Discussion at many of the cluster meetings concerned this need to coordinate projects, with one cluster actually defining clustering "in

its simplest sense" as the "coordination of TTT projects for their mutual benefit." Throughout many cluster meetings, ways of coordinating projects to work together voluntarily and profitably were sought. A question frequently raised was, "How can separate projects work together more advantageously than if alone?" Participants at one cluster meeting agreed that the National TTT Program should be developmental, leading to an improved system of teacher training at the T, TT, and TTT levels, perhaps including the development of models of such training. They advocated furthering complementary relations among the projects, but decided it was not likely (or desirable) that a "super-project" would result from such an endeavor. They stressed the advantages inherent in exchanging personnel (especially for short-term consultative and evaluative purposes), materials, and other training resources.

Attendees at a meeting of another cluster, however, stressed the need to coordinate projects within that cluster mainly as a way of creating "a complete example, within a geographical region, of teacher education which is responsive to the communities served by the schools and which engages the disciplines, colleges, universities, schools, state department of education, federal agencies, and communities in the preparation of teachers who will help children learn and develop as they need to." Thus they advocated creation of a "super-project," but only within their own cluster. To develop such a "super-project," they suggested activities such as workshops on different campuses illustrative of the strong points of each host campus' activities and visits to various sites to observe "innovative" approaches. Members at this

meeting even recommended obtaining "outside expertise on how to run a corporation."

Discussion at a meeting of yet another cluster concerned means of shaping a unified program while still honoring diversity among the projects within that program. Members agreed that both fragmentation arising from each project's working independently and rigidity arising from too much interdependence among program components should be avoided.

In general, coordinating projects for their mutual benefit was regarded as a moderately desirable objective of clustering. It was considered effective, for example, in enabling projects to discover ways of involving parents (part of the community) and other groups in the process of education, in improving methods of staff training, and in other operational aspects of TTT.

Disseminating information among program components was rated "very important" by 67 percent responding to the questionnaire with only 4 percent rating this purpose "not important." This objective rated second highest among all the objectives. Those persons most likely to regard this objective as "very important" had roles as project directors or project staff.

In data available to CIRCE, recommendations concerning types of information that should be disseminated, as well as means of disseminating it, among program components were found. Some persons within TTT were found to favor increased dissemination of information at the national level, while others recognized a greater need for more "intracluster" dissemination. Not much data were available concerning "intracluster" dissemination, defined here as the dissemination of materials

between clusters but without "interventions" from those at the national level.

With reference to dissemination of information conducted at the national level, one person interviewed via telephone perceived the need for "a volume published at the national level . . . containing a synopsis of every project in the program." With reference to intra-cluster dissemination of information, many cluster meeting attendees advocated increased exchange of information concerning projects within their own cluster. One cluster established at its center a "clearinghouse" for the dissemination of materials within the cluster. The types of services the center planned to provide include preparing and distributing an annotated directory of each project in the entire TTT Program and a list of commendable consultants, speakers, and other resource persons of potential help to individual projects. Also at the intra-cluster level, some cluster directors asked that projects within their clusters send the director any papers of possible interest to other projects of the cluster. In addition, there was much enthusiasm regarding cluster newsletters. Many persons recommended that such newsletters be continued since they have proven in most cases to be a very effective means of disseminating relevant information. (Cluster newsletters are also, it should be noted, of interest to persons outside the particular cluster.)

It therefore seems that the dissemination of information among program components is considered very worthwhile as an objective of clustering in TTT and should obviously be continued with as much, or even more, emphasis in the future.

About 40 percent of the respondents to the questionnaire rated fostering and establishing a broad base of support for the program "very important," 43 percent rated it "somewhat important," and 17 percent rated it "not important." Although many persons reportedly placed some importance on this objective, very few references in any other data examined by the evaluation staff were made to the need for achieving this objective. The need to foster and establish a broad base of support for TTT was included in a statement made at one of the cluster meetings that projects should indicate who is being trained, by whom, and for what purposes in order to impress influential persons and gain support for TTT. Another example of the awareness of the need to fulfill this objective occurred at a different cluster meeting during which the topic of discussion changed abruptly from that of community participation to "finding prestigeous persons" to convince, through lecturing, the nation of the necessity of support for the National TTT Program.

It seems, then, that although a considerable number of persons feel this objective is important, not much emphasis on achieving it has been placed at the cluster level.

Most respondents (82%) rated stimulating exchange and interaction "very important" to them as a major purpose of clustering. Thus, this objective was rated highest among all the objectives provided. Only one person, a project director (role) in the education (parity) group, rated this purpose "not important." At least 81 percent of each parity group, with the exception of the participants (of whom 60 percent did so), rated this purpose "very important." In terms of role in TTT, all

consultants regarded stimulating exchange and interaction "very important," but only 69 percent of the students did so. (Since the participants and student groups probably overlap a great deal, these findings seem consistent with those cited above.) At least 82 percent of the members of the other role groups regarded this objective "very important."

Much discussion of "sharing of resources with other projects," an important example of exchange and interaction, has occurred. Such sharing has great potential in solving problems of individual projects both within and beyond each cluster. References to the importance of this objective and ways of achieving it have been made in response to the questionnaire, during cluster meetings, during the telephone interviews, during the meeting of cluster directors, and in written correspondence. In a letter to projects within his cluster, one cluster director stressed the importance of sharing of resources among program components (not just projects, he implied) in bringing about "maximum impact on schools, pupils, and institutional change." In addition, the emphasis of many cluster meetings has been on ways of achieving this objective, with many cluster meetings devoted to the actual solving of problems common to individual projects.

One means of furthering exchange and interaction among projects is inter-project visitation. The advantages of visitation between projects were stressed in much of the data examined by the evaluation staff. Inter-visitation of projects has been upheld by many persons in TTT as a means better than (or in addition to) cluster meetings for the exchange of ideas. With reference to the importance of inter-project visits as a

means of stimulating resource sharing, one telephone interviewee stressed the benefits of learning through observation rather than through "just hearing project descriptions." This person regarded cluster meetings as relatively, "useless." Another interviewee in support of furthering visitation objected mainly to "big" meetings, suggesting that exchange could more profitably take place by having persons from "more highly developed projects" work with those of projects less well-developed.

At this point, one might say, "Yes, visitation is important, but it can be accomplished independently of clusters. Personnel from one project can themselves arrange to visit another project. They don't need cluster help." It is true that visits can be arranged at the project level, but as stated at the meeting of cluster directors, many inter-project visits could not have occurred without at least financial help from cluster centers.

In addition to visitations, another means of furthering exchange and interaction through clustering is the establishment of "data banks." Throughout the various developmental stages of the TTT Program, projects have been encouraged to send to their cluster centers materials and other information to be shared with others. One cluster explicitly discussed the advantages of establishing a "data bank" of relevant information to be made available to all TTT projects. A related recommendation concerning the sharing of resources was made at a meeting of one cluster. It was suggested that applications for positions within the National TTT Program be submitted to the cluster center instead of to projects themselves. Through exchange and interaction between the project and the

rest of its cluster, applicants could then be matched with projects on the basis of characteristics of applicants and the particular work situation. Using such a method, much localism would be eliminated and expertise could be utilized very effectively. Participants at this meeting also suggested isolating features (goals, problems) common to projects within clusters and determining ways in which cluster activities could influence educational practices at the national level. Finally, it was suggested that the exchange and/or placement of graduates of TTT project programs might become a purpose of cluster activity.

Respondents to the questionnaire were asked to indicate their personal awareness of their project's involvement in "sharing of resources with other projects," an important example of exchange and interaction. Only about half of the respondents indicated such awareness. Project directors were most likely to be aware of such sharing, implying lack of adequate exchange and interaction within many of the projects themselves. Those persons aware of their project's involvement in sharing of resources with other projects were asked to indicate specific resources that have been shared. Resources most often cited as being shared between projects were ideas (both written and spoken) and personnel. Video tapes and newsletter items were also cited by some respondents.

It seems then that stimulating exchange and interaction is viewed as the most important objective of clustering in TTT. A number of suggestions concerning its value and ways of achieving it have been discussed and in some cases implemented.

Providing communication between the project and USOE was cited "not important" by 16 percent of the respondents. Members of all cluster groups except the Midwest Cluster tended to respond "somewhat." The Midwest group contained 46 percent of those responding "not." This purpose seldom appeared in data examined for this report, indicating its limited degree of importance particularly to those persons at the project and cluster level. It is important to note, however, that respondents considered this purpose most important from the perspective of USOE.

Overall, in terms of the questionnaire respondents' perceptions of how well each of the stated purposes were being fulfilled, most responses regarding each objective were in the "somewhat" category. Stimulating exchange and interaction received the highest percentage (33%) of "quite well" responses. Disseminating information among program components received 30 percent "quite well" responses. Coordinating projects for their mutual benefit received the lowest percentage (8%) of "quite well" responses.

The more extensive analysis retained by CIRCE shows no significant differences among the various groups in terms of how well each purpose was being fulfilled. Therefore, in this case the only purpose for studying such tables would be to see which types of respondents were more likely to respond a certain way. CIRCE found no such data of enough interest to report in this section. For example, in terms of how well monitoring and giving direction to projects was being fulfilled, 34 percent responding stated it was being fulfilled "not well." The tables we have show that the school parity group and the advisory members and

"others" in terms of role in TTT were more likely to rate this objective as being "quite well" fulfilled, but differences were not significant.

The Organizational Structure of Clusters. An aspect of major concern in this discussion of clustering in TTT is the organizational structure of clusters. As mentioned at the beginning of this report, a variety of bases for organizing clusters were considered during the planning stages of the National TTT Program. The present, basically geographical means of organizing clusters was selected from among these alternatives. To what extent has this basis of organizing clusters been effective? To what extent have the various persons involved in TTT been satisfied with this basis? How effective has it been in facilitating the achievement of the goals of not only the entire Program but also of the individual projects within the Program? Answers to such questions lead to decisions concerning the following: To what extent should the geographical basis of clustering be continued? (To what extent should the geographical basis be replaced or supplemented by other bases?) Some of the items on the TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire, interviews with project directors, discussions at cluster meetings, and the meeting of cluster directors in New Orleans pertain to this area of concern.

Questionnaire data reveal that only 5 percent of the respondents were "highly" satisfied with the present, basically geographic, organizational structure of clusters. But 45 percent were "quite" satisfied, and an additional 35 percent were "somewhat" satisfied. Of those 43 persons not at least "quite" satisfied, a majority recommended a topical

basis of organization. Further support for topical organization might be inferred from responses to the questionnaire item, "I would prefer to be in a cluster in which projects were similar to ours." Forty-three percent of the respondents were in agreement with this statement. This finding is consistent with observations during several cluster meetings at which persons felt that grouping "similar" projects together would be extremely helpful to them.

A considerable reaction from various sources emerged that the past year's cluster arrangement was somewhat restrictive for obtaining a broad perspective to crucial problems. To illustrate, 42 percent of the questionnaire respondents were found to "Strongly Agree" and 37 percent to "Agree" with the following statement: "I would like to meet with people in other projects outside my cluster." Favorable reactions of participants attending the one joint cluster meeting held (Southern and Appalachian Clusters) provides evidence to encourage the continuation of such organizational arrangements. As one such attendee stated, "Bringing the two groups (clusters) together was of benefit because it created a broader audience." Participants at the Social Science Cluster Meeting (held to study the effects of changing from the geographical to other basis of clustering) valued highly meeting on a topical basis with persons across TTT projects, but valued even more highly the contributions of non-TTT resource people in attendance.[4]

During the telephone interviews, a number of project directors commented that cluster meetings should occur at different levels. This

---

[4]"A Report on a Social Science Conference." TTT Northeast Regional Cluster, Clark University, 1970.

suggestion was based on the assumption that meeting the interests and needs of all persons in attendance at a meeting is impossible because of the diversity of persons involved in TTT. A significant number of meeting attendees reported much of the discussion at meetings to be irrelevant to them. For example, several project directors felt that they would benefit more from meetings attended only by project directors. They were careful to stress that the content of such meetings should be planned by the directors and not by USOE. Another frequent suggestion was the scheduling of meetings at the parity group level. Quite often it was observed at cluster meetings that community representatives reacted negatively to the content of meetings. On the other hand, if the meeting were organized around the community's interests, the educationists would only "politely participate."

A final consideration of the organizational structure of clusters is the means whereby cluster activities are initiated. Too often clustering activity was viewed as being imposed "from above." This frequently resulted in clustering, especially cluster meetings, being conducted in a superficial and mandatory manner. Some project directors looked for "instant" representatives of the various parity groups to take to cluster meetings. There was evidence of compliance with requests "from above," but too often the compliance did not fulfill the spirit of the request. In this regard, several project directors recommended that clusters be arranged administratively to better facilitate initiatives made at the project level.

Thus it seems that although there has not been widespread and intense dissatisfaction with the present organizational structure of

clusters, substantial evidence exists for promoting greater flexibility and variety in organizing cluster activities. Supplemental means for facilitating local initiative and for grouping persons periodically with others who share common interests as well as with people with a variety of interests has been recommended.

Knowledge and Impact of Clustering. It was indicated earlier that "stimulating exchange and interaction" and "disseminating information among program components" were viewed by questionnaire respondents as the best achieved purposes of clustering. These findings are consistent with the data which indicated that 98 percent of the respondents were at least "somewhat familiar" with the activities of their local project, and 73 percent were at least "somewhat familiar" with cluster activities.

Within their cluster (but outside their project) respondents listed the following project activities as impressive: the University of Chicago's resource colleague and internship program, North Dakota's New School of Behavior, Clark University's program, Minnesota's involvement of the community, Harvard's involvement of professors directly in the secondary schools, Temple University's inner city program, Nebraska's language arts program, the University of Miami's concept of vertical involvement along the educational ladder, San Francisco's STEP and STEP-UP programs, and New York City University's project. Less frequently mentioned responses include Colorado's "live-in ghetto" experience, Washington State Department of Education's use of performance criteria for counselor certification, San Francisco

State's involvement of students in multi-ethnic schools, Portland State University's cooperation with Jefferson High School, Syracuse University's action teams, Washington University's day-care program, and the San Fernando Valley program.

Those respondents who indicated specific activities were asked to state how they initially became familiar with the activity. The overwhelming majority of persons became familiar with the activity they mentioned through either cluster meetings (46%) or personal contact (35%). About eight percent became familiar with the activity through newsletters, six percent through visitation, four percent through a project director. Such findings provide insight into the most effective means of disseminating ideas throughout the entire Program.

To what extent had respondents who indicated activities that impressed them actually interacted (verbally or in writing) with personnel of this activity? Most persons had engaged in "little" (21%) or "no interaction" (30%), with only six percent having engaged in "high interaction."

Respondents were asked if there had been any change in their thinking or any intended or actual changes in their projects attributable to the activity with which they had been impressed. About 34 percent reported no changes at all, 25 percent reported changes in thinking, 27 percent reported changes in thinking and intended changes in their projects, and the remaining 15 percent reported changes in thinking and actual changes in their projects.

When asked to indicate the nature of changes that did occur, most persons (40%) mentioned community involvement. Five percent mentioned involvement of persons in the liberal arts. In addition, five percent adopted aspects of the resource colleague idea of the University of Chicago, while three percent of the respondents specified each of the following changes: revised thinking about training techniques for experienced teachers, broadened internship possibilities, greater awareness of the need for better communication among directors, trainees, and community persons within projects, and recognition of the fact that community involvement need not be in traditional "committee" form.

Less frequently mentioned responses include: administrative changes making supervision easier, involvement of teacher trainees in project decision-making, work on values in education, clarification of undergraduate-graduate student relationship, reaffirmed belief in the importance of developing a model of teacher training, recognition of the need for full-time commitment of university professors, addition of volunteers and teachers to day care centers, seeking ways to recruit a potential advising committee on parity, recognition of the need for a paraprofessional on-site coordinator, and seeking ways to recruit potential teachers from minority groups.

Reaction to Cluster Meetings

The expectation of participants is an important consideration when discussing reactions to cluster meetings. It is interesting to note that before attending the cluster meetings on which the TTT

Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire was based, the purposes of the meeting were either "hardly clear" or "not clear" to one-fourth of the respondents. To 39 percent responding, the purposes were only "somewhat clear," and to only 14 percent the purposes were "very clear."

Over-half (53%) of those who had attended an earlier meeting noted a substantial improvement in the later one. Overall, 87 percent responding recommended attendance at future cluster meetings to others like themselves.

Twenty of the questionnaire respondents indicated that they would not recommend attendance at future cluster meetings to others like themselves. Among reasons given for this negative reaction were a lack of congruence between the objectives of the meetings and the particular activities used to accomplish those objectives; a lack of relevance of the meetings to the goals of the National TTT Program; a perceived lack of purpose for cluster meetings; uncertainty about the participant's own role and the value of his attendance at the meetings; and the belief that the value of the meetings does not warrant their cost.

In addition to the above open-ended responses, questionnaire respondents indicated their amount of agreement or disagreement with a number of statements concerning cluster meetings, usually on a five-point scale ranging from strong agreement to strong disagreement. About 63 percent either agreed or strongly agreed that at the cluster meeting in question they made new contacts useful in their roles in TTT. In response to the negatively stated item, "I do not see the value in

my attending cluster meetings," only 11 percent either agreed or strongly agreed, with most respondents disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. With reference to scheduling, a moderate percentage (46%) of respondents felt that the "cluster meeting was timely in terms of activities at the TTT project" with which he was associated. About 54 percent agreed or strongly agreed that the purposes of the cluster meeting were clear to them. Finally, regarding the relationship between topics discussed at cluster meetings and the respondent's position in TTT, only 19 percent responding agreed or strongly agreed that the topics were not relevant.

Added insight concerning general reaction to cluster meetings was gained through examination of non-questionnaire sources of data. Particularly useful in this respect were observations at cluster meetings and the telephone survey of project directors.

A CIRCE observer at a meeting of one cluster noted that many in attendance reported cluster meetings useful to them. Participants at a West Coast Cluster meeting, however, showed a great deal of dissatisfaction with much of what occurred and voiced the feeling of many outside their cluster that merely sharing experiences among projects is insufficient. Those at the West Coast meeting said that cluster meetings should feature the introduction of new ideas concerning teacher training, especially with reference to the disadvantaged. They emphasized that, to achieve this end, student contributions should be solicited because the student "is experiencing reality." The student therefore knows areas requiring attention and can suggest steps to positive action, the West Coast participants said.

With reference to discussing strong and weak points of projects at cluster meetings, one cluster director concluded that such discussion is "valuable as an initial cluster activity" in that it makes "each project and director visible" and "involves each project with every other project." However, he noted that such activity is limited across clusters. This director suggested that future meetings deal with issues across projects rather than just within individual projects, with an extended amount of time allocated to discussion.

A CIRCE observer at the second meeting of another cluster perceived that most persons there regarded the meeting as generally useful and otherwise good in that it dealt with many issues, included much communication among various groups, and modified its agenda according to group consensus.

A newsletter of one cluster described one of its meetings as "often heated and tense as participants attempted to communicate, to explain, and to be heard." A CIRCE observer at another meeting of the same cluster, however, described it as greatly lacking in inter-personal interaction, with those directing the meeting "talking at" participants. Also he noted that special interest groups tended to interact mainly within their groups, having little contact with others even during the lunch break. Observers at other cluster meetings also noted the tendency for persons to limit their contacts. One project director interviewed via telephone commented that cluster meetings are "a good mechanism for getting people together, but people don't know what they are together for." Another interviewee said, "The meetings get people

of like minds together, but are not productive. There is not enough discussion of basic and fundamental matters." Supportive of such notions is the need cited by another project director for reappraisal of cluster meeting accomplishments.

To one interviewee, "cluster meetings are a waste of time." To another, they have a detrimental effect on his project's operation since attendance at cluster meetings gives some of his project representatives, "especially community people and students," ... "unrealistic expectations of their role in project governance."

Another interviewee felt project directors should meet by themselves occasionally so that they could work together "without the hassle from other groups," implying that participation by persons other than project directors interferes with accomplishing his goals.

One project director commented during the interview on the scheduling of cluster meetings. He referred to the problem of planning his budget to include attendance at cluster meetings. He suggested that meetings should be scheduled far enough in advance (e.g., even a full year) so that project budgets could be planned realistically and then be adhered to.

As can be seen by this brief summary, opinion regarding cluster meetings ranged widely. Cluster meeting participants who had little direct involvement with the TTT Program (e.g., community) found the cluster meetings more useful than persons with direct involvement (e.g., project directors and staff). But persons with direct involvement found subsequent cluster meetings improved over earlier meetings.

Parity

A topic of major concern to those involved in the National TTT Program is parity. Throughout all types of data examined in preparing this report, references were made to this concept and its implementation in the Program. Essentially, parity has been defined as the "significant involvement and representation of all groups..." in "cooperative decision-making processes." However, much difficulty has been encountered through out the Program because of lack of information, misinformation, and other causes of skepticism concerning the definition, rationale, and methods of implementing parity.

Although extensive discussion of the parity concept will not be made in this report, data from the TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire pertaining to parity will be presented and briefly discussed. Such a brief presentation should provide some insight into the types of concerns expressed across the entire Program regarding the concept of parity in TTT.

Despite the fact that so much discussion of parity has taken place throughout the Program, data from the questionnaire support the conclusion that such discussion was not excessive. Responses to the item, "Too much emphasis has been placed on parity in TTT," were quite evenly distributed over the five response categories designated. About 42 percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 39 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed, and the remaining 19 percent were neutral concerning this item. Non-questionnaire data show that persons in TTT expressed concern in particular with the following question: Are

projects really involving members of all groups in a meaningful way, or are they just bringing in persons (bodies) to sit and listen to proceedings?

In response to the item, "Educationists are overly concerned with their professional role in teacher education," responses again were fairly evenly distributed, but with higher response rates for the categories at the disagreement end of the scale. About 36 percent of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, and about 47 percent either disagreed or strongly disagreed.

For the item, "The liberal arts and science people are truly involved in the teacher-education programs," percentages responding at the agreement and disagreement ends of the scale were almost equal. About 42 percent responded with agreement, and 41 percent with disagreement. Questions were raised during many of the cluster meetings about the role of the liberal arts in TTT and in teacher training in general. During some of the meetings, the following question caused much concern: Is the involvement of the liberal arts sufficient? Much of the emphasis on including the liberal arts in TTT seems to have arisen from recognition of the need to develop a more humanistic approach in the schools. Some persons acknowledged TTT as a specific attempt to get liberal arts and science people to take interest and action in teacher education.

In response to the item, "Most demands of the community people are reasonable," 21 percent responding strongly agreed, 47 percent agreed, 21 percent were neutral, and only 11 percent either disagreed

or strongly disagreed. During the first year of the TTT Program the community has been most discussed of all the parity groups. A participant at one cluster meeting, stated that USOE had not provided a satisfactory explanation for including the community in the parity concept. It was speculated that the community had been included for one or more of the following three reasons--because of the American democratic tradition; to facilitate good public relations (Community representatives could interpret objectives and procedures to the rest of the community); or to provide feedback on community reaction to educators. However, in reality, the inclusion of community in parity appeared to be more a function of complying with the demands of this group rather than any *a priori* rationale.

Other questions raised about the community include the following: How is *community* defined? How should the community representatives be selected? (How can bias in selection of representatives of the community be avoided?) How can projects involve the community as intensively as possible? Do members of the community have the ability to participate in a meaningful way? What should be the role of community representatives? (Should it be merely advisory or should it include policy-making?) How can community interest and participation in teacher training and children's learning be fostered? (How can parents of the community become more involved in what happens in the schools?) What can be done to help close the communication gap between the community and the other groups included in relations of parity? (Would the use of paraprofessional resource persons help?)

With respect to the school parity group, about 27 percent of the questionnaire respondents strongly agreed that "The schools are the place for teacher education to happen." Thirty-five percent agreed, 20 percent were neutral, 13 percent disagreed, and 5 percent strongly disagreed with the statement.

School representatives at a meeting of one cluster discussed at length the role of the school in the preparation of teachers, and means of attaining and maintaining school-university-community parity. With respect to the role of the school, participants felt that the schools certainly have both a role and a responsibility in preparing teachers, but that since school resources are limited, money and personnel from TTT are needed. The school representatives stated that the school must maintain contact with the community, perhaps through the use of paraprofessional aids from the community working jointly for the university and schools. Such paraprofessionals would have to be a "hybrid variety" in order to remain comfortable in the variety of situations in which they would find themselves. The participants felt that teachers in the schools should have more responsibility in the selection of TTT recruits, since in-service teachers would be more capable of selecting recruits most likely to benefit from TTT participation and to benefit the community as well.

With reference to the means of attaining and maintaining school-university-community parity, the school group perceived positive signs in their relationship with the universities but felt that the university should become more involved in the practical, daily world of the public school.

Although no question on the questionnaire pertained explicitly to the student group in relation to parity, it was discovered that no structure or means exists in most TTT projects for participants to express their views. Student involvement has recently become a critical issue in American education. The following issues have repeatedly been raised concerning the students in TTT: What is the role of the student in policy-making in TTT and in the educational setting in general? What can TTT do to develop methods and procedures involving students in planning, implementing, and evaluating their education both within and outside the TTT Program? At one of the cluster meetings, a lack of communication between the university, public school, and participants in TTT was noted. The participants, it was concluded, should be included as a fifth group in parity relations. This view was also supported by others in TTT, including those in top administrative positions.

Questionnaire respondents were asked to indicate, to the best of their knowledge, the extent ("For the most part," "Somewhat," or "Little, if any") to which parity was being achieved in each of the following situations--their project planning, project operation, cluster meeting planning, and cluster meeting program. The following percentages reveal the extent to which respondents felt parity was being achieved "for the most part" in each of the above situations--53 percent (project planning), 47 percent (project operation), 25 percent (cluster meeting planning), and 32 percent (cluster meeting program). This indicates perception of a greater amount of parity in project planning than in project operation, more parity in project

than in cluster activities, and more parity in planning programs for cluster meetings than in other aspects of cluster meeting planning.

Responses in the "little, if any" category also implied the achievement of more parity in project-level, than in cluster-level activities. About 29 percent indicated "little, if any" parity in cluster meeting planning, 25 percent in cluster meeting program, 10 percent in project planning, and 7 percent in project operation.

When asked to indicate the extent ("Substantially," "Moderately," "Somewhat," "Little," or "Not at all") to which they felt parity in project planning and project operation could be achieved within the next two years, responses revealed much optimism in this respect. The majority of respondents felt parity could be "substantially" achieved in both project planning (68%) and operation (64%). Many (22% and 24% respectively) felt it could be "not at all" achieved in project operation, with no persons responding negatively in terms of project planning.

This brief discussion has attempted to point out some of the fundamental concerns surrounding the concept of parity in TTT. It has shown that parity seems to be operating more extensively on the project than cluster level, and that at the project level, more in planning than in operational aspects. However, with reference to parity at the project level, there seems to be confidence that the amount of parity in planning and in operation can be significantly increased in the near future.

APPENDIX A: Cluster Meeting Observation Form

CLUSTER MEETING OBSERVATION FORM
Trainers of Teacher Trainers Evaluation

Cluster _____

Meeting Location _____

Meeting Dates _____

This is the _____ meeting of this cluster.

Observer _____

Instructions

Be sure to obtain a copy of all hand-out material at the meeting. A list of participants and the agenda are very important.

The questions on this form should be answered after you have attended a session. It would be well to become very familiar with the questions before you attend the meeting, but we suggest that you not use the form during the meeting. We suggest, rather, that you take notes during the meeting as though you were a participant and then complete the forms in your room using your notes and your memory. One form should be completed for each session listed on the agenda. Forms are also provided for recording information about other things like conversations, bull sessions, ad hoc meetings, etc.

It is important that the observer describe accurately the events of the cluster meeting. If observer impressions or opinions are made, they should be labeled as such.

FORMAL SESSION NO. ____

Location _____ Time _____ Date _____

1. Type of session: (*Circle one*) Lecture, Lecture-discussion, Discussion, Panel, Workshop, Reporting, Other _____ *(specify)*

2. Organization: Total group, half of the group, small group

3. Number of people in attendance: _____;

   Male _____ Female _____

   White _____ Black _____ Latin _____

   USOE _____ Community _____ School _____ Educ. _____ LAS _____ Student _____

4. Person in charge of session: _____

5. Room situation:

							Comments
Seating:	Adequate	5	4	3	2	1	Crowded _____
Accoustics:	Good	5	4	3	2	1	Bad _____
Lighting:	Adequate	5	4	3	2	1	Poor _____
Comfort:	Adequate	5	4	3	2	1	Poor _____

6. Complete the following for each formal presentation. (*Go to Q. 7 if session did not have a formal presentation.*)

   Presenter No. _____

   Name (Mr., Mrs., Miss) _____
   (last) (first) (initial)

   Title/Position _____

   Length of presentation: _____
   (time started) (time ended) (length)

   Topic of presentation: _____

   Main points covered: _____

   _____ _____

   _____

Rating of presentation:

Organization:	Well organized	5	4	3	2	1	Poorly
Stimulation:	Very stimulating	5	4	3	2	1	Dull
Clarity:	Clear	5	4	3	2	1	Unclear
Pacing:	Well paced	5	4	3	2	1	Not well paced

Audience reaction:

Attentive:	Very attentive	5	4	3	2	1	Inattentive
Hostility:	Sympathetic	5	4	3	2	1	Hostile
Interest:	Interested	5	4	3	2	1	Disinterested
Questions:	Much questioning	5	4	3	2	1	Little questioning

General comments and impressions: _____

What were the questions and the discussion about? _____

Presenter No. _____

Name (Mr., Mrs., Miss) _____
(last) (first) (initial)

Title/Position _____

Length of presentation: _____
(time started) (time ended) (length)

Topic of presentation: _____

Main points covered: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Rating of presentation:

Organization:	Well organized	5	4	3	2	1	Poorly
Stimulation:	Very stimulating	5	4	3	2	1	Dull
Clarity:	Clear	5	4	3	2	1	Unclear
Pacing:	Well paced	5	4	3	2	1	Not well paced

Audience reaction:

Attentive:	Very attentive	5	4	3	2	1	Inattentive
Hostility:	Sympathetic	5	4	3	2	1	Hostile
Interest:	Interested	5	4	3	2	1	Disinterested
Questions:	Much questioning	5	4	3	2	1	Little questioning

General comments and impressions: _____

_____

_____

_____

What were the questions and the discussion about? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Presenter No. _____

Name (Mr., Mrs., Miss) _____
(last) (first) (initial)

Title/Position _____

Length of presentation: _____
(time started) (time ended) (length)

Topic of presentation: _____

Main points covered: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Rating of presentation:

Organization:	Well organized	5	4	3	2	1	Poorly
Stimulation:	Very stimulating	5	4	3	2	1	Dull
Clarity:	Clear	5	4	3	2	1	Unclear
Pacing:	Well paced	5	4	3	2	1	Not well paced

Audience reaction:

Attentive:	Very attentive	5	4	3	2	1	Inattentive
Hostility:	Sympathetic	5	4	3	2	1	Hostile
Interest:	Interested	5	4	3	2	1	Disinterested
Questions:	Much questioning	5	4	3	2	1	Little questioning

General comments and impressions: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

What were the questions and the discussion about?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Complete the following if Panel Discussion (*Go to Q. 8 if not appropriate*).

Name Position

Members of the Panel: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Length of session: _____
(time started) *(time ended)* *(length)*

Topic of presentation: _____

Main points covered: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Rating of Presentation:

Organization:	Well organized	5	4	3	2	1	Poorly
Stimulation:	Very stimulating	5	4	3	2	1	Dull
Clarity:	Clear	5	4	3	2	1	Unclear
Pacing:	Well paced	5	4	3	2	1	Not well paced

Audience reaction:

Attentive:	Very attentive	5	4	3	2	1	Inattentive
Hostility:	Sympathetic	5	4	3	2	1	Hostile
Interest:	Interested	5	4	3	2	1	Disinterested
Questions:	Much questioning	5	4	3	2	1	Little questioning

General comments and impressions: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

What were the questions and the discussion about? _____

_____

_____

8. Complete the following if Workshop or Discussion Session. Summarize the workshop activity or the discussion topic, i.e., what went on in the session. _____

Was there a product of the session, e.g., a consensus report, a list of issues, a plan, etc.? Yes _____ No _____

(If yes) What was it in terms of content? _____

INFORMAL ACTIVITIES

1. Describe the setting _____

2. What went on? _____

3. List the salient points covered. _____

APPENDIX B: Cluster Meeting Registration Form

CLUSTER MEETING REGISTRATION FORM

Trainers of Teacher Trainers Program

1. Name (Mr., Mrs., Miss) _____
(last) *(first)*

2. Address _____
(street) *(city)* *(state)* *(zip)*

3. Telephone _____ Date _____
(area code) *(number)* *(month)* *(day)* *(year)*

4. How many Cluster Meetings have you attended previously?

None . . . . [ ] One . . . . [ ] Two . . . . [ ] Three or more . . [ ]

5. Identify the TTT Project with which you are connected, if any.

_____

6. With which one of the following parity groups do you *primarily* identify? *(Check one)*

Community . . . . . [ ]
Teacher Education . . . [ ]
Liberal Arts. . . . . [ ]
Participant . . . . . [ ]
School. . . . . [ ]

7. Within this primary parity role, what is your main working role in TTT?

Cluster Director . . . [ ]
Project Director . . . [ ]
LTI Member . . . . . [ ]
Project Staff. . . . . [ ]
USOE Staff. . . . . [ ]
Student . . . . . [ ]
Advisory Member . . . [ ]
Consultant. . . . . [ ]
Other _____ . . [ ]
(specify)

8. Approximately what percent of your total working time is spent in your primary role with TTT?

Less than 25% . . . . . [ ]
25% - 49% . . . . . [ ]
50% - 74% . . . . . [ ]
75% or more . . . . . [ ]

9. Approximately how long have you been affiliated with TTT in this capacity?

_____

10. Do you have a work role outside TTT? *(Check one)* Yes . . . [ ] No . . . [ ]

11. *(If yes)* Briefly indicate the firm or organization for whom you are employed. Give job title. Describe the nature and specific duties of your work activity.

Institution or Firm _____

Title _____

Activity and duties _____

_____

12. About what percent of your total working time is spent in this outside role? *(Check one)*

Less than 25% . . . . . [ ]
25% - 49% . . . . . [ ]
50% - 74% . . . . . [ ]
75% or more . . . . . [ ]

APPENDIX C: TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire

TTT CLUSTER MEETING AND CLUSTERING QUESTIONNAIRE
Trainers of Teacher Trainers Evaluation
Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
270 Education Building, University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

TO SELECTED CLUSTER MEETING PARTICIPANTS:

There are many important aspects of the United States Office of Education TTT Program about which descriptions and judgments of worth might be made. As one facet in the evaluation of the TTT National Program, we at the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE) have prepared a Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire for a carefully selected sample of persons to complete. This questionnaire is designed to obtain some of your opinions about the *most recent* general cluster meeting which you attended and about TTT clustering in general. We realize the difficulty you might have in remembering specific impressions about this cluster meeting since it occurred some time ago, but we would like you to recall as best you can.

The information that you provide in this questionnaire about this specific cluster meeting and about clustering will be of value to the TTT National Program Administrators. It is important that every participant who has been sent this form complete and return this questionnaire in the self-addressed return envelope, so the reactions of the total sample will be reflected. It is our estimate that you will be able to complete this form in approximately 15 minutes.

We are asking you to indicate your name only to facilitate coordination of the returns. The questionnaire is completely confidential. Particular replies will be treated in summary form and names will *not* be associated with specific replies. Your cooperation is truly appreciated. Thank you.

Name [Mr. / Mrs. / Miss] _____ Date _____
(last) (first)

Address _____
(street) (city) (state) (zip)

Indicate where you attended your
most recent general cluster meeting _____
(city) (state)

DO NOT WRITE

1. With which one of the following parity groups do you <u>primarily</u> identify? *(Check one)*

Community. . . . . 1[ ]
Education. . . . . 2[ ]
Liberal Arts . . . . . 3[ ]
Participant. . . . . 4[ ]
School . . . . . 5[ ]

11

2. Within this primary parity role, what is your main working role in TTT? (Exclude cluster role.)

Project Director . . 1[ ] Student. . . . . 4[ ]
LTI Member . . . . . 2[ ] Advisory Member. 5[ ]
Project Staff. . . . 3[ ] Consultant . . . 6[ ]
Other _____ . . 7[ ]
(specify)

12

3. Approximately what percent of your total working time is spent in your primary working role with TTT?

Less than 25%. . . . 1[ ] 50% - 74%. . . . 3[ ]
25% - 49%. . . . . 2[ ] 75% or more. . . 4[ ]

13

4. Do you have a work role outside TTT? *(Check one)*

Yes . . 1[ ] No . . 2[ ]

14

5. *(If yes)* Briefly indicate the firm or organization for whom you are employed. Give job title. Describe the nature and specific duties of your work activity.

Firm _____ ( )15
( )16
Title _____ ( )17
( )18
Activity and duties _____

_____

6. About what percent of your total working time is spent in this outside role? *(Check one)*

Less than 25%. . . 1[ ] 50% - 74%. . . . 3[ ]
25% - 49%. . . . . 2[ ] 75% or more. . . 4[ ]

19

DO NOT WRITE

7. Prior to your attending the cluster meeting, how clear were the purposes of the meeting to you? *(Circle one)*

5	4	3	2	1	20
Very Clear	Quite Clear	Somewhat Clear	Hardly Clear	Not Clear	

8. Was your initial reason for attending the cluster meeting a result of your own desire to attend the meeting, or to satisfy the request of someone else, or both? *(Circle one)*

Your own desire to attend . . . 1[ ]
At other person's request . . . 2[ ]
Both. . . . . 3[ ] 21

9. *(If only at other person's request)* Identify this person by indicating his major role in TTT (e.g., Cluster or Project Director).

_____ ( )22

10. A few clusters have had more than one general meeting. Have you attended an earlier meeting besides the one you attended most recently?

Yes . . . . 1[ ] No . . . . 2[ ] 23

11. *(If yes)* How would you rate this most recent meeting compared to the earlier one?

Substantially better . . . . . 1[ ]
About the same . . . . . 2[ ]
Substantially worse. . . . . 3[ ] 24

12. If another cluster meeting were to be held, would you recommend attendance to others like yourself?

Yes . . . . 1[ ] No . . . . 2[ ] 25

13. *(If no)* Why not?

_____ ( )26
( )27
_____ ( )28

_____

DO NOT WRITE

14. Below are listed the major purposes of clustering. For each purpose, check the category that best indicates the importance <u>you</u> personally place on it.

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	
A. To monitor and give direction to projects .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	29
B. To coordinate projects for their mutual benefit	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	30
C. To disseminate information among program components.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	31
D. To foster and establish a broad base of support for the program	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	32
E. To stimulate exchange and interaction	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	33
F. To provide communication between the project and USOE. . . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	34

15. In regard to the above purposes, circle the letters of those <u>three</u> purposes that you feel are considered most important by the USOE.

A B C D E F

( )35
( )36
( )37

16. For each of the above purposes, indicate how well you feel they are presently being fulfilled.

	Quite Well	Somewhat	Not Well	
A	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	38
B	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	39
C	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	40
D	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	41
E	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	42
F	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	43

17. In general, do you agree with the purposes of the cluster activity? *(Circle one)*

5	4	3	2	1	
Highly	Quite	Somewhat	Hardly	Not at all	44

DO NOT WRITE

18. Indicate the extent of your familiarity with the activities of your local TTT project and your familiarity with your cluster.

	Highly Familiar	Quite Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Hardly Familiar	Not Familiar	
Project:	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	45
Cluster:	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	46

19. Within your TTT cluster (but outside your project), think of one project activity, if any, that impresses you highly. Briefly describe this activity.

_____ ( )47

_____ ( )48

_____ ( )49

20. Indicate how you initially became familiar with this project activity (e.g., newsletter, visitation, personal contact).

_____ ( )50

21. To what extent have you interacted (verbally or through correspondence) with the personnel of this activity since finding out about it? *(Circle one)*

5	4	3	2	1	
High Interaction	Much	Some	Little	No Interaction	51

22. Have there been any changes in your thinking, do you intend any changes in your project, or have changes been made in your project which could be attributed to this feature with which you have been impressed?

Yes, change in thinking . . . . . 1[ ] 52
Yes, change in thinking and intended change in project . . . . . 2[ ]
Yes, change in thinking and actual change in project . . . . . 3[ ]
No change in thinking, no intended change, and no actual change in project . . . 4[ ]

23. *(If yes)* Specify the change and its substance.

_____ ( )53

_____ ( )54

DO NOT WRITE

24. To the best of your knowledge, indicate the extent to which parity is being achieved in each situation listed below. *(Check one for each situation)*

	For the most part	Somewhat	Little, if any	
Your project planning	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	55
Your project operation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	56
Cluster meeting planning	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	57
Cluster meeting program	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	58

25. For each of Project planning and Project operation, indicate the extent to which you estimate your project will be <u>able to deliver</u> parity in the next one to two years.

	Project Planning	Project Operation	
Substantially . . .	[ ]	[ ]	59
Moderately.	[ ]	[ ]	60
Somewhat.	[ ]	[ ]	
Little.	[ ]	[ ]	
Not at all.	[ ]	[ ]	

26. To what degree are you satisfied with the present organizational structure of your cluster, which is basically geographic?

5	4	3	2	1	
Highly	Quite	Somewhat	Little	Not at all	61

27. *(If not at least quite satisfied)* Indicate the structural arrangement that you would recommend for reorganizing the present cluster (e.g., topical, size of project, city-rural).

_____ ( )62

_____

_____

28. Are you aware of your project's involvement in the sharing of resources (personnel, materials, ideas) with other projects?

Yes . . . . 1[ ] No . . . . 2[ ] 63

29. *(If yes)* What specific resources have been shared between your project and others?

_____ ( )64

_____

	DO NOT WRITE
30. The following items have been prepared so that you can indicate how you <u>feel</u> about important aspects of TTT. In each case, circle the letter which represents <u>your</u> reaction as to whether you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), are Neutral (N), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD). If you would like to clarify your answer, please do so.	
A. Too much emphasis has been placed on parity in TTT. . . . SA A N D SD	65
B. I would like to meet with people in other projects outside of my cluster. . . . . SA A N D SD	66
C. Educationists are overly concerned with their professional role in teacher education. . . . . SA A N D SD	67
D. The project with which I am associated has not fulfilled the hopes I had for it . . . . SA A N D SD	68
E. I made new contacts useful to me in my role in TTT at the cluster meeting. . . . . SA A N D SD	69
F. The liberal arts and science people are truly involved in the teacher-education programs . . . . . SA A N D SD	70
G. My attitude about TTT is one of enthusiasm. . . . . SA A N D SD	71

		DO NOT WRITE
H. I do not see the value in my attending cluster meetings. . SA A N D SD		72
I. Too little attention has been given in TTT to the culturally different . . . . . SA A N D SD		73
J. In my opinion clustering has greatly increased the communication among TTT projects . . SA A N D SD		74
K. I would prefer to be in a cluster in which the projects were similar to ours. . . . . SA A N D SD		75
L. The cluster meeting was timely in terms of activities at the TTT project in which I am directly involved . . . . . SA A N D SD		76
M. Most demands of the community people are reasonable . . . . SA A N D SD		77
N. The purposes of the cluster meeting were clear to me. . . SA A N D SD		78
O. The schools are the place for teacher education to happen . SA A N D SD		79
P. In general, the topics presented and discussed at the cluster meeting were not relevant to me in my position in TTT. . . SA A N D SD		80

APPENDIX D: Summary Data from TTT Cluster Meeting
and Clustering Questionnaire

SUMMARY DATA FROM TTT CLUSTER MEETING
AND CLUSTERING QUESTIONNAIRE

1. With which one of the following parity groups do you primarily identify?

Community	10.9%
Education	57.7%
Liberal Arts	11.7%
Participant	7.3%
School	12.4%

2. Within this primary parity role, what is your main working role in TTT? (Exclude cluster role.)

Project Director	27.9%
LTI Member	0.0%
Project Staff	28.7%
Student	9.6%
Advisory Member	11.8%
Consultant	4.4%
Other	17.6%

3. Approximately what percent of your total working time is spent in your primary working role with TTT?

Less than 25%	35.3%	50% - 74%	16.2%
25% - 49%	16.9%	75% or more	31.6%

4. Do you have a work role outside TTT?

Yes	75.4%
No	24.6%

5. About what percent of your total working time is spent in this outside role?

Less than 25%	16.0%	50% - 74%	17.9%
25% - 49%	18.9%	75% or more	47.2%

6. Prior to your attending the cluster meeting, how clear were the purposes of the meeting to you?

Very Clear	14.1%
Quite Clear	22.2%
Somewhat Clear	38.5%
Hardly Clear	14.8%
Not Clear	10.4%

7. Was your initial reason for attending the cluster meeting a result of your own desire to attend the meeting, or to satisfy the request of someone else, or both?

Your own desire to attend	25.5%
At other person's request	19.7%
Both	54.7%

8. *(If only at other person's request)* Identify this person by indicating his major role in TTT (e.g., Cluster or Project Director).

Project Director	60.7%
Cluster Director	28.6%
President of College	3.6%
Dean	3.6%
Harry Rivlin	3.6%

9. A few clusters have had more than one general meeting. Have you attended an earlier meeting besides the one you attended most recently?

Yes	24.1%
No	75.9%

10. *(If yes)* How would you rate this most recent meeting compared to the earlier one?

Substantially better	52.9%
About the same	38.2%
Substantially worse	8.8%

11. If another cluster meeting were to be held, would you recommend attendance to others like yourself?

Yes	86.8%
No	13.2%

12. *(If no)* Why not?

Objectives and activities not congruent	20%
Role I played unclear; question value of my attendance	20%
Value does not warrant cost	15%
No clear purpose for cluster meetings is ever presented	10%
Meetings must pertain to TTT goals	10%
Hearing the clustering message once is sufficient	5%
Written communication would do the job	5%
Our project is unique; cannot learn from others	5%
Clustering should occur by mutual consent on ad hoc basis	5%
Depends upon my situation and purpose of the meeting	5%

13. Below are listed the major purposes of clustering. For each purpose, check the category that best indicates the importance you personally place on it.

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
A. To monitor and give direction to projects	33.1%	45.9%	21.1%
B. To coordinate projects for their mutual benefit.	49.3%	39.6%	11.2%
C. To disseminate information among program components. . . .	66.7%	28.9%	4.4%
D. To foster and establish a broad base of support for the program	40.3%	42.5%	17.2%
E. To stimulate exchange and interaction	82.2%	17.0%	0.7%
F. To provide communication between the project and USOE. .	35.6%	48.1%	16.3%

14. In regard to the above purposes, circle the letters of those three purposes that you feel are considered most important by the USOE.

A . . . 43.5%	D . . . 44.3%
B . . . 43.5%	E . . . 55.7%
C . . . 48.9%	F . . . 62.4%

15. For each of the above purposes, indicate how well you feel they are presently being fulfilled.

	Quite Well	Somewhat	Not Well
A	12.0%	53.6%	34.4%
B	7.6%	58.5%	33.9%
C	29.9%	44.1%	26.0%
D	16.1%	48.4%	35.5%
E	33.1%	51.6%	15.3%
F	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%

16. In general, do you agree with the purpose of the cluster activity?

Highly . . . 27.7% Quite . . . 43.1% Somewhat . . . 24.1%
Hardly . . . 3.7% Not at all . . . 1.5%

17. Indicate the extent of your familiarity with the activities of your local TTT project and your familiarity with your cluster.

	Highly Familiar	Quite Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Hardly Familiar	Not Familiar
Project . .	77.0%	17.0%	4.4%	1.5%	0.0%
Cluster . .	10.7%	19.8%	42.0%	22.9%	4.6%

18. Within your TTT cluster (but outside your project), think of one project activity, if any, that impresses you highly. Briefly describe this activity.

Percentages for most frequently mentioned responses are:

Can't think of any; none.	11.0%
University of Chicago: resource; colleague idea; internship program.	5.5%
North Dakota: New School of Behavior	4.6%
Exchange of information	3.7%
Clark University program.	3.7%
Minnesota: involvement of community.	3.7%
Harvard: professor working in secondary schools. . . .	3.7%
Temple University: Philadelphia inner city	3.7%
Nebraska program (langauge arts).	2.8%
University of Miami: vertical involvement along educational ladder.	2.8%
San Francisco State: STEP and STEP-UP programs	2.8%
New York City University project.	2.8%

Less frequently mentioned responses include: Colorado's "live-in ghetto" experience, University of Missouri's research on educating the under-priviledged, Washington State Department of Education's performance criteria for counselor certification, San Francisco State's student work in multi-ethnic schools, Portland State University's cooperation with Jefferson High School, Syracuse's action teams, Washington University's day care, and the San Fernando Valley program.

Most frequently mentioned projects are: New School of Behavior (North Dakota), STEP and STEP-UP (San Francisco), Philadelphia inner city project (Temple University), University of Nebraska, University of Miami, Harvard University, University of Minnesota, New York City University, and University of Chicago.

19. Indicate how you initially became familiar with this project activity (e.g., newsletter, visitation, personal contact).

Cluster Meeting . . .	46.2%	Newsletter . . .	7.5%	Project Director . .	3.8%
Personal Contact. . .	34.9%	Visitation . . .	5.7%	HEW (USOE)	0.9%
		Assistant District Superintendent of Schools			0.9%

20. To what extent have you interacted (verbally or through correspondence) with the personnel of this activity since finding out about it?

High Interaction	5.7%
Much Interaction	14.8%
Some Interaction	27.9%
Little Interaction	21.3%
No Interaction	30.3%

21. Have there been any changes in your thinking, do you intend any changes in your project, or have changes been made in your project which could be attributed to this feature with which you have been impressed?

Yes, change in thinking	25.0%
Yes, change in thinking and intended change in project	26.7%
Yes, change in thinking and actual change in project	14.7%
No change in thinking, no intended change, and no actual change in project	33.6%

22. *(If yes)* Specify the change and its substance.

Percentages for most frequently mentioned responses are:

Involvement in community	40.0%
Involvement of liberal arts people	4.6%
Adapting resource colleague idea (Chicago) to community people and their role in teacher education	4.6%
Change in thinking about training techniques for experienced teachers	3.1%
Broadening of internship possibilities	3.1%
Aware of need for more communication between director, trainees, and community within project	3.1%
Community involvement need not be by traditional "committee" form	3.1%

Less frequently mentioned responses include: administrative changes making supervision easier, involvement of teacher trainees in project decision-making, work on values in education, clarification of undergraduate-graduate student relationship, reaffirmed belief in the importance of developing of a model of teacher training, recognition of the need for full-time commitment of university professors, addition of volunteers and teachers to day care center, seeking of ways to recruit potential advising committee on parity, and recognition of the need for a paraprofessional on-site coordinator, and seeking of ways to recruit potential teachers from minority groups.

23. To the best of your knowledge, indicate the extent to which parity is being achieved in each situation listed below.

	For the most part	Somewhat	Little, if any
Your project planning . . .	53.4%	36.6%	9.9%
Your project operation. . .	46.8%	46.0%	7.1%
Cluster meeting planning. .	25.0%	45.8%	29.2%
Cluster meeting program . .	32.0%	42.6%	25.4%

24. For each Project planning and Project operation, indicate the extent to which you estimate your project will be <u>able to deliver</u> parity in the next one to two years.

	Project Planning	Project Operation
Substantially	68.3%	64.2%
Moderately.	22.0%	24.4%
Somewhat.	5.7%	7.3%
Little.	4.1%	2.4%
Not at all.	0.0%	1.6%

25. To what degree are you satisfied with the present organizational structure of your cluster, which is basically geographic?

Highly	4.6%
Quite.	45.4%
Somewhat	34.6%
Little	12.3%
Not at all	3.1%

26. *(If not at least quite satisfied)* Indicate the structural arrangement that you would recommend for reorganizing the present cluster (e.g., topical, size of project, city-rural).

Topical	55.8%
Urban (city) focus.	11.6%
Geographical.	11.6%
Social settings (urban, inner city, rural) served by projects in cluster should be similar	7.0%
Diversity of regions should be represented in cluster . . .	4.7%
Too few projects in cluster	2.3%
Dissolve clusters; replace with national meetings each six months planned by USOE.	2.3%
More rural focus.	2.3%
Ad hoc clusters (by subject matter or problem area)	2.3%

27. Are you aware of your projects involvement in the sharing of resources (personnel, materials, ideas) with other projects?

Yes 49.6%
No. 50.4%

28. *(If yes)* What specific resources have been shared between your project and others?

Ideas (written materials, correspondence)	28.8%
Ideas (generally)	16.9%
Personnel	15.3%
Project visitation.	13.6%
Video tapes	6.8%
Ideas for community involvement	6.8%
Consultant advice	5.1%
Newsletter items.	5.1%
Need periodic reports exchanged among similar projects.	1.7%

29. The following items have been prepared so that you can indicate how you <u>feel</u> about important aspects of TTT. In each case, circle the letter which represents <u>your</u> reaction as to whether you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), are Neutral (N), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD). If you would like to clarify your answer, please do so.

	SA	A	N	D	SD
A. Too much emphasis has been placed on parity in TTT	16.2%	25.4%	19.2%	20.8%	18.5%
B. I would like to meet with people in other projects outside my cluster	41.9%	36.8%	16.9%	3.7%	0.7%
C. Educationists are overly concerned with their professional role in teacher education	18.5%	17.0%	17.8%	25.9%	20.7%
D. The project with which I am associated has not fulfilled the hopes I had for it.	3.7%	15.7%	11.2%	40.3%	29.1%
E. I made new contacts useful to me in my role in TTT at the cluster meeting	18.4%	44.9%	24.3%	9.6%	2.9%
F. The liberal arts and science people are truly involved in the teacher-education programs.	12.7%	29.1%	17.2%	20.9%	20.1%

29. (Continued)

	SA	A	N	D	SD
G. My attitude about TTT is one of enthusiasm.	48.9%	32.6%	9.6%	5.9%	3.0%
H. I do not see the value in my attending cluster meetings.	2.2%	8.8%	10.3%	50.0%	28.7%
I. Too little attention has been given in TTT to the culturally different	5.2%	15.7%	13.4%	44.8%	20.9%
J. In my opinion clustering has greatly increased the communication among TTT projects.	8.8%	37.1%	25.8%	19.7%	9.1%
K. I would prefer to be in a cluster in which the projects were similar to ours	15.6%	27.4%	23.7%	27.4%	5.9%
L. The cluster meeting was timely in terms of activities at the TTT project in which I am directly involved.	11.2%	35.1%	23.9%	21.6%	8.2%
M. Most demands of the community people are reasonable	20.6%	47.3%	21.4%	7.6%	3.1%
N. The purposes of the cluster meeting were clear to me.	9.6%	44.1%	16.2%	21.3%	8.8%
O. The schools are the place for teacher education to happen	26.9%	34.6%	20.0%	13.1%	5.4%
P. In general, the topics presented and discussed at the cluster meeting were not relevant to me in my possition in TTT.	2.2%	16.4%	14.9%	47.8%	18.7%